

Appl. No. 09/618,190
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 23 January 2003

Page 7 of 8

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 15-20 are newly added.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to state whether the drawings are acceptable.

The Office action rejects:

claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Rautila (USP 6,524,189); and

claims 3, 5, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Rautila and Makela (USP 6,301,338).

The applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in view of the amended claims.

The applicant teaches and claims a mobile apparatus that includes two communications channels, and a processor that is configured to facilitate transfer of data from one channel to the other by converting the data from the format of the first channel to the format of the second channel. Claim 1 is amended herein to include the limitations of original claim 9; i.e. that the processor is configured by data received from either communication channel. Claim 12 is similarly amended to include this limitation.

The Office action bases the rejection of the original claim 9, now amended claim 1, on Rautila's column 4, lines 32-48 (Office action, page 3, lines 9-11). The applicant respectfully traverses this characterization of Rautila. At the cited text, Rautila is silent with regard to *configuring* the processor by data received from the communication channels. Rautila consistently teaches that the user configures the processor, and neither teaches nor suggests that the processor is configured by the data received from the communication channels.

Because Rautila neither teaches nor suggests a processor that converts data from a format of a first communication channel to a format of a second communication channel and is configured based on data received from either communication channel, as specifically claimed in amended claim 1, upon which claims 2-8 depend, and amended claim 12, upon which claims 13-14, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-8 and 12-14 over Rautila.


Appl. No. 09/618,190
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 23 January 2003

Page 8 of 8

The Examiner has acknowledged that dependent claim 10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 10 is correspondingly amended herein, and claim 9 is amended to be dependent upon claim 10. Newly added claims 15-20, as well as original claim 11, are also dependent upon claim 10. The applicant respectfully requests the allowance of claims 9-11 and 15-20, based on the acknowledged allowability of claim 10.

In view of the foregoing, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. McDermott, Attorney
Registration Number 41,508
patents@lawyer.com

1824 Federal Farm Road
Montross, VA 22520
Phone: 804-493-0707
Fax: 215-243-7525